



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,492	01/31/2001	Daniel J. Graney	P/12-839	3104

7590 03/02/2004

CHIEF PATENT COUNSEL  
ENGLEHARD CORPORATION  
101 WOOD AVENUE  
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

DICUS, TAMRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/774,492

Applicant(s)

GRANEY, DANIEL J.

Examiner

Tamra L. Dicus

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1774

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed 7-3-03. Cancellation of claims 10-22 are acknowledged.

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,451,449 to Shetty et al. in view of USPN 6,602,585 to Graney.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,451,449 to Shetty et al. in view of USPN 6,602,585 to Graney.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application claims an uniaxial oriented multilayered film, while the Shetty reference claims a film that has not been oriented uniaxially having a mechanical property ultimate tensile at break of 2.5 to 9 kgf and/or 4.5 to 7 kgf (claim 2), thickness of 0.007-0.034 mm, and thread width of 0.15 to 0.33 mm (claim 9). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make an uniaxial oriented multilayered film having a

Art Unit: 1774

mechanical property ultimate tensile at break of 2.5 to 9 kgf and/or 4.5 to 7 kgf (claim 2) since Graney teaches a shrinkable iridescent film, providing it is known to uniaxially stretch/orient a coextruded multilayered iridescent film. See col. 3, lines 55-63. A multilayered iridescent film having tensile at break being 2.5 to 9 kgf and/or 4.5 to 7 kgf (claim 2) is optimizable. Especially since the film has the same thickness as Applicant claims. The same film thickness is taught and claimed by Graney at col. 5, lines 20-36 and patented claim 1. Stretching the film of Shetty to yield the tensile at break property as in the instant application is optimizable because tensile at break is effected by the stretch ratio and thickness of a film. It is a common property obtained from a mechanical test using an instrument such as an Instron. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272. Although no tensil properties are mentioned by Graney, stretching films are contemplated and the films are oriented in the same manner as applicant claims. Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the film of Shetty where a multilayered iridescent film has a tensile at break of 2.5 to 9 kgf and/or 4.5 to 7 kgf (claim 2) since it has been held that experimental modification of the prior art in order to ascertain optimum operating conditions (e.g. stretch ratios, temperatures, speed of the tensile gauges, or other process variables that effect mechanical properties such as tensile strength/tear) fails to render Applicant's claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Shetty teaches the refractive index is at least about 0.06. See patented claim 6. Also regarding the amount of multilayers being at least 35 in instant claims 3 and 6, see patented claim 4.

Art Unit: 1774

Regarding claims 4 and 7, the film being a terephthalate is claimed, see patented claim 7.

Regarding claim 5 and 8, the only difference is that the contiguous adjacent layer is a thermoplastic elastomer. An elastomer is well known in the art to use since Graney teaches elastomers are suitable to use in coextruded films at col. 1, lines 55-68. Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the uniaxial oriented film of Shetty to include an elastomer since Graney teaches elastomers are conventional to use.

Regarding claim 9, Patent '499 differs in that it is not formed in a microfilament having a width of 0.15 to 3 mm. However, Shetty provides the same film. That the film is formed in a thread having the aforesaid width is not in itself construed to be a matter of invention. It is well known to change the shape and size of a film which happens to be the same material commensurate with the use. For example, plastic tape, food wrap, or lenses have various thicknesses. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). Further, a film formed as a thread having a 0.15 to 3 mm width is a mere optimizable adjustment as width is an result effective property. Width effects the strength. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1774

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamra L. Dicus whose telephone number is 571-272-1519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-4:30 p.m., alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tamra L. Dicus  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1774

February 23, 2004



ELIZABETH MULVANEY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER